DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 492 PS 012 677

AUTHOR	Condry, Sandra; Hayes, William A.
TITLE	Report on Pilot Test Of Impact and In-Depth Measures. Child and Family Mental Health Project.
INSTITUTION	Urban Inst. for Human Services, Inc., San Francisco, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[80]
CONTRACT	HHS-105-77-1057
NOTE	25p.; For related documents, see PS 012 674-676.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Data Collection; *Evaluation Methods; *Family Programs; Longitudinal Studies; *Measurement Techniques; Measures (Individuals); *Mental Health Programs; Pilot Projects; *Research Design; Sampling; Training
IDENTIFIERS	*Child and Family Mental Health Project; *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This document reports the pilot test of the two components of the Child and Family Mental Health (CFMH) Evaluation Project -- the impact evaluation component and the in-depth evaluation component. (The impact evaluation is designed to determine the effects of the two primary prevention models of service and activities on the CFMH Head Start programs as compared to their designated controls. The in-depth evaluation is designed to assess the effects of the CFMH's primary preventive activities on Head Start children, families, staff, and center atmosphere.) First, the document specifies the procedures to be used in the pilot study for selecting programs and samples of Head Start children, teachers, and parents, outlines observational schedules, and discusses procedures for the recruitment, hiring, and training of staff. Next, the document briefly reviews the instruments selected for the evaluation and explicates the conditions of use, revisions, and permissions attained to use the instruments. Finally, the site monitors' field operations and data management procedures are described. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213492

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

REPORT ON PILOT TEST OF IMPACT AND IN-DEPTH MEASURES

CHILD AND FAMILY MENTAL HEALTH PROJECT

CONTRACT NO. HHS 105-77-1057

AUTHORS:

SANDRA CONDRY, PH.D.
WILLIAM A. HAYES, PH.D.

PS 012677

PREPARED BY:

THE URBAN INSTITUTE FOR
HUMAN SERVICES, INC.
1330 GOUGH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94109

PREPARED FOR:

STEVEN MARTINEZ, PH.D., PROJECT OFFICER
RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND DEMONSTRATION DIVISION
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES
OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20201

The Spring data collection site visits were designed to obtain process evaluative data and to pilot test both the measures and procedures to be used in the impact and in-depth evaluations in Phase III. The process evaluative data were to have been collected in all Experimental and Control sites as the post-test for Phase II. At the time data collection was scheduled to begin, the Office Management and Budget (OMB) had not granted approval to use the process instruments previously designed and field tested. The collection of process data was postponed and subsequently cancelled after approximately two weeks of a five week data collection schedule had passed.

The pilot studies of the impact and in-depth evaluation proceeded as the previously published measures to be used did not require OMB approval. Procedurally, the major ramification of cancelling the process data collection was the loss of an opportunity to assess the impact of collecting process, impact and in-depth data on a single site visit as required in Phase III of the evaluation.

The impact evaluation is designed to determine the effects of the two primary prevention models of service and activities in the CFMH Head Start programs as compared to their designated controls. The in-depth evaluation is designed to be a given-tuned assessment of primary preventive activities on Head Start children, families, staff and center atmosphere. The in-depth evaluation focuses on a subsample of the CFMH centers and will emphasize observations made by a third party. The in-depth evaluation complements the impact evaluation by providing more intense and precise assessments of program impact.

The contract scope of work stipulates that the pilot study of impact measures be performed at a minimum of four Head Start sites. Two of the sites had to be experimental programs and two had to be control programs. Of the two experimental programs, one was to be a Mental Health Worker Model and the other a Community Resource model. The con-

tract also specified that the pilot testing of in-depth measures were to be conducted in two programs--one an experimental and one a program. These stipulations defined the parameters within which site selections were made.

Selection of Pilot Programs

Within the parameters explicated by the contract, there were several additional considerations influencing the selection process. To be maximally beneficial, it was judged that the programs selected for the impact and in-depth pilot studies should be characterized by: (a) the use of a range of primary preventive activities in order to test the sensitivity of the measures to reflect the impact of a variety of intervention strategies; (b) the implementation of primary preventive activities which offer some promise of being effective; and (c) the use of primary activities that were generally representative of the range of experimental and control programs. It was further decided to select at least one Head Start program with multiple centers some distance from each other. Such a center would allow the field procedures to be tested by the logistical challenges offered by geographically dispersed centers. Finally, cost consideration suggested that we select Head Start programs in close proximity for the pilot test. Therefore, considerations of travel cost were given priority over any advantages offered by the use of sites yoked as experimental and control. With these constraints in mind, the selection process progressed through several stages.

The CFMH Experimental programs were categorized into Mental Health Worker and Community Resource models. Descriptive information on each Experimental program was compiled from program grant proposals, the Urban Institute for Human Services' Phase I Report, and information gathered during the Fall 1979 site visits (i.e., site monitor reports and process interviews with the Mental Health Providers). From these sources was abstracted information on the size of the program (e.g., number of children enrolled, the number of centers); the administrative

functioning of the program (e.g., extent of staff turnover and internal politics); the activity of the CFMH project (extent of parent participation, the types of activities); and practical logistical information (availability of space for interviewing teachers and parents, amount of class time when children and teachers could be observed, quality of local interviewers, cooperation of parents, extent of perceived physical danger to outsiders).

Experimental programs were eliminated from consideration as a pilot site if this information indicated: a relatively inactive CFMH project; significant Head Start personnel problems; perceived physical danger to Urban Institute for Human Services' field persons; or non-representativeness of Head Start program (i.e., very large of very small program, completely urban program, unique relations with other agencies such as a public school system or a migrant program). As intended, only a few programs remained from which to select one Mental Health Worker model and one Community Resource model. Since any of these few programs were appropriate choices, a quasi-random selection was made. The Community Resource Experimental program selected Indiana, Pennsylvania, and the Mental Health Worker model program selected was Georgetown, Texas.

The ACYF Regional offices were contacted to determine if the selected programs were in compliance with the Head Start mental health guidelines. The Support Services Contractors were also contacted to discern whether they had information that would indicate that these were inappropriate choices. The two programs, Indiana, Pennsylvania and Georgetown, Texas were readily acceptable to the Support Services Contractors and the programs' mental health components were in compliance with federal guidelines.

Sample Selection

The impact and in-depth pilot tests required that samples of Head Start children, teachers, and parents be selected. The contract stipulated sample sizes of 20 and 40 children for the impact and in-depth pilots, respectively. It was decided to make the child the sampling unit and link the parent to the child selected. Therefore, the child and parents' samples were selected in one procedure.

The size of the population from which the child sample was selected was reduced by just selecting centers and classrooms from which the sample would be drawn. Centers within Head Start programs were selected to reduce the amount of travel necessary to observe all children in the sample. Within these centers, classrooms were selected in a manner that allowed child observers the option of moving to another classroom to observe other children within the same day.

Within a sample classroom, letters were sent to parents to obtain written permission to allow their child to participate as well as to obtain their consent to be interviewed. The actual selection of the child was made by the child observer after entering the selected classroom. From a list of children whose parents had provided written consent and who were present, the child observer selected from 4 to 5 children equally divided between girls and boys. Thus, a child became a part of the sample only if he/she was observed.

Teachers and teacher aides were included in the sample only if their classroom was selected and children in the classroom were selected in child samples. The number of teachers to be included in the sample was not specified in the contract. A decision was made to maximize the number in order to maximize the set of data on which future evaluative and policy decisions are based and to decrease the time any individual teacher must devote to rating the children in his/her class.

Observational Schedules

The number of days required to complete data collection on each site was partially determined by sample size, the amount of time required to complete each measure, the number of observations to be made, and the availability of key Head Start personnel. These factors, in turn, determined the length of the number of days on each site. Since the observations were the most costly measures used, the schedule was designed to maximize the probability that the required number of observations were made.

All children were to be observed and their behavior coded on two different accasions. Since one child observation required approximately one hour, two observers would require four to five mornings to complete the required 20 sets of observations for the impact evaluation. Therefore, the impact site visits were scheduled for one week. The in-depth samples of 40 children required a two-week schedule, schedules of observations were prepared to allow each observer to be in each classroom once in four or five days. Observations were scheduled to allow 50% of the child and teacher observations to be made simultaneously and 50% to be made at different times. The procedure was designed to determine the differential effect of having one-versus-two observers in the classroom. The pairing of child and teacher observers was rotated so that each child observer and each teacher observer was matched at least once during a week of observations. A sample schedule of child and teacher observation is attached as Appendix A. The optimal observation schedule was modified in practice to adjust for absence of child or teacher on scheduled observation days, and scheduling difficulties.

Recruitment and Hiring of Field Staff

The impact and in-depth evaluations required three types of field staff. A site monitor was needed to direct the data collection teams at each Head Start program. Observers were needed to make child

and teacher observations as well as interview Head Start teachers. Interviewers, who were residents of the cities in which the Head Start programs were located, were needed to interview Head Start parents.

Recruitment for Site Monitors and observers involved the circulation of job announcements to the colleges and universities in the Bay Area and the California Department of Employment. As well, an advertisement was placed in the employment section of the San Francisco newspapers. A further search for Spanish-speaking applicants for the observer positions was conducted by contacting employment counselors, selected faculty members of Bay Area colleges and universities, and by soliciting the aid of directors of La Raza and ethnic studies programs.

The applications resulting from the job announcements were reviewed and screened by the research scientist in charge and ranked on the basis of general research, interviewing, classroom and observation experience. Selected applicants were invited to be interviewed. During the interview, the specific requirements of the positions were explained. In the case of applicants for observers positions, it was emphasized that observers would only be sent to the field if he/she achieved an 80% reliability score on the observational measure on which he/she would be trained.

The outcome of the process led to the hiring of nine Site Monitors (seven for the field teams and two alternates) and ten observers (4 field team, child observers and 1 alternate; 4 field team teacher observers and 1 alternate). The alternates were hired for the training period only. Their assignment to the field team was contingent upon a vacancy becoming available.

Training of Site Monitors

The training of Site Monitors was divided into two sessions. Three days of training took place prior to the site development visits (March 12-14, 1980) an additional three day session (April 7-9, 1980) was conducted after the site development visits, but before the data collection visits. Copies of the training schedules are reflected on the following pages. The thrust of the training was to: (1) provide Site Monitors with the philosophy and programs of Head Start; (2) provide a detailed description of the CFMH program; (3) provide a complete understanding of the CFMH Evaluation Project; and (4) train Site Monitors on the use of data collection instruments. The second training session included a debriefing discussion on site development, training on the use of the CFMH log, a session on training interviewers to administer parent interviews, a refresher training on interviewing techniques, and a session on administrative procedures.

Training of Observers

The training of Child and Teacher Observers was conducted in two parts. The first part of the training was conducted in two parts. The first part of the training was conducted by SRI-International. During this part of the training the Child and Teacher Observers were trained separately. The agenda and format of the training sessions were very similar. In both cases, trainees needed to become familiar with the physical format of the coding system, the code names for the behavior categories, the contents of each category and its boundaries.

The second part of the training was conducted by the staff of the Urban Institute for Human Services. On the last day, training of observers and Site Monitors was combined. A detailed description of the observer training follows.

Training by SRI-International. One week before a training session started, the Urban Institute mailed a training packet (provided by SRI-International) to each observer. This packet introduced the behavior codes used by the observation system, with definitions and example behaviors. Trainees were told to know the codes by the first training session, using the exercise sheets included with the packet, to facilitate learning. The training agenda was briefly outlined (see Appendix B).

Midafternoon on the fourth day, all observers and Site Monitors came to the Urban Institute to sign contracts, their contracts to receive pay checks and advances. The Impact and In-Depth Research Scientist met briefly with each observer individually to congratulate the person on his/her fine performance during the training, to encourage him/her to work closely with the Site Monitor and other observers, to be sensitive to Head Start relations and ask if there were any individual problems which the Research Scientist should anticipate and any other phone numbers the Research Scientist should have.

The first two days of the training sessions were spent practicing and also testing the trainees' knowledge of the codes. Flashcards were used to encourage speed in encoding. Coding practice was given, using videotaped vignettes of nursery school interactions. Each evening there were homework problems which were discussed the following day. The third through fifth days, trainees spent two hours at a local nursery school, observing and coding the behavior of the focus person. Discussion of coding problems followed each observation session. Videotaped vignettes were also coded and discussed. Practice reliability-testing started on the second day and occurred each day thereafter. The sixth and seventh days were spent solely at SRI. The final day consisted mainly of warm-up coding and then coding of criterion tapes to establish a reliability score for each trainee. Feedback was provided after scoring was completed by the trainer and the Research Scientist.

All trainees achieved better than the requisite 80% agreement with the trainer's coding. The five Teacher Observers (SRI Preschool Observation Instruments, scored Preschool Observation Instrument) scored 92, 90, 88, 88 and 86; the average reliability score was 88.8%. The Child Observers (Prescott-SRI Child Observation Instrument) scored 94, 93, 91, 90 and 80; the average reliability score was 89.6% agreement with the trainers.

One or two weeks later, and 2-3 days before entering the field, the observers returned to SRI-International for 1 day of refresher training. During this session, observers coded videotape vignettes, discussed problems and took a shorter reliability test. Again, all observers achieved better than the requisite 80% agreement with the trainer. Teacher Observers displayed an average score of 91.5% with a range of 90-94. Child Observer scores ranged from 80-100 with an average of 93.3%.

Observer training by Urban Institute staff. This training session lasted three days and was the first time the two field teams met and worked together. A rapid pace was set and maintained because there were so many topics to be introduced and assimilated.

To facilitate the assimilation process, observers received a second training packet two weeks before the Urban Institute training session. This consisted of a complete set of the teacher measures (i.e., the CFMH Process Interview, the CIRCUS Educational Environment Questionnaire, the Kohn Social Competence Rating scale). The appropriate observers also received the Brown IDS Self-Concept Reference Test. Observers were asked to familiarize themselves with each measure and practice administering it (see Appendix C).

On the first day of training, observers met separately from the Site Monitors (Process-only, Impact and In-Depth, and laternates). After a brief introduction by the Research Scientist and the CFMH Pro-

ject Director the Observers were welcomed and presented an overview of the CFMH Project. The Research Scientist then delineated the tasks to be accomplished in the following three days and emphasized that the training meetings were to be viewed as seminars, not classes (i.e., it was important that everyone participate by asking questions, raising problems, and offering solutions). The Impact and In-Depth Site Monitors as well as an alternate Site Monitor were briefly introduced to the Observers. The Impact and In-Depth measures were reviewed; problems that had arisen in administering them were discussed. At this time, Observers were informed that the Schedule of Recent Experiences had been dropped from the In-Depth battery of measures.

Observers received their training manuals and their responsibilities and tasks were received for questions. Topics discussed were general responsibilities, introductory meetings with Head Start staff, child observations and teacher observations in classrooms, teacher interviews, teacher aide meetings, child interview, editing of observation booklets and interviews, daily meetings with Site Monitor, final Observer and Site Monitor meeting, on-site sampling procedures and the Observer report (see Appendix D for greater detail). The final task of the first day was to perform practice observations using videotapes borrowed from SRI-International. This task was included because SRI experience has shown that Observers need to practice the codes daily to retain facility in translating observations into codes. The higher reliability scores obtained during the SRI refresher training indicate the usefulness of this additional practice. An audio tape was made of this training session.

The second day of Observer training at the Urban Institute for Human Services was conducted jointly with Site Monitors. After a brief introduction of all participants, the morning session began with training on interviewing techniques and then practice interviewing, using the Teacher-Process instrument. (At the time, OMB clearance of this and other Process instruments was anticipated.) Responsibility for the after-

noon session was shared among the Urban Institute staff. The Impact and In-Depth Research Scientist introduced the role of the Observers to the Process Site Monitors and briefly discussed the role-relationships among Site Monitors and Observers. Questions were answered. The Process Research Scientist discussed the entrance and exit meetings to be held by the Site Monitors at each program. The Research Associate discussed administrative and logistical information, concerning consultant fee claims, expense records, itinerary, car rental, and the identification numbering system (for Head Start programs, center and classrooms, respondents, observers and interviewers). Plane tickets were distributed. Many questions were posed and answered. Finally, all Observers and Site Monitors signed an affidavit of confidentiality.

On the third and fourth days of training, half of the Observers attended the SRI-refresher training session, while the other half attended the Urban Institute training. The Impact and In-Depth Site Monitors attended these last days of Urban Institute training. The Impact Site Monitor reviewed and expanded upon the interview training provided the previous day. Specific questions were discussed and answers provided. Practice observations using videotapes were made. In the afternoon, Observers received the Observation Schedules for the first week of data collection. These were discussed and questions were answered. The In-Depth Child Observers practiced administering the Brown Self-Concept Test, including the operation of the Polaroid cameras.

Impact and In-Depth Measures

The procedure and rationale used for the selection of Impact and In-Depth measures are presented in a previous report entitled Review and Recommendation of Impact and In-Depth Instruments. The following section briefly reviews the instruments selected and explicates the conditions of use, revisions, and permissions attained to use the instruments. Al impact and in-depth instruments were previously published.

Impact Measures

Two observation measures were selected, the SRI-Prescott Child Observation System and the SRI Preschool Observation System (Adult Focus). Both these measures are closed, technical systems which require highly trained observers for implementation. A second teacher measure is a portion of the CIRCUS 17 - Educational Environment Questionnaire. The measure selected to assess the impact of the CFMH Project on parents is the Home Inventory Scale.

The measure of impact of the CFMH Project on the child in addition to the Prescott Observation System, is the Kohn Social Competence Scale. This is scale to be completed by a child's teacher and also by a teacher aide. A revised version of the Kohn Social Competence Scale was prepared to provide a parent's rating of her/his child.

SRI Observation Instruments. The SRI-Prescott Child Observation System and the SRI Preschool Observation System (Adult Focus) require specially trained observers, specially-developed optically scannable booklets for recording the data and specific miscellaneous materials such as pens, signal boxes and earphones. Permission to use the two observation systems required earphones. Permission to use the two observation systems required contracting with SRI to provide observer training sessions at SRI in Menlo Park, California, consisting of 7 full days of

training for 6 (or fewer) persons and 1 day of refresher training for each system.

SRI requires that an Observer trainee attain an 80% reliability rating before SRI will recommend that person as an Observer. In the past, some trainees have not achieved that level of expertise by the end of the training period.

In addition, SRI agreed to provide the Urban Institute for Human Services with marking pens, 250 SRI Preschool and 90 SRI-Prescott observation booklets, and to rent the necessary signal boxes and beepers. The Urban Institute for Human Services was to be responsible for paying Observers' salaries and expenses during the training sessions. SRI agreed to make recommendations to Urban Institute for Human Services regarding the capability of each observer to collect reliable data. The Urban Institute for Human Services was to be responsible for editing, scanning, and processing of the resulting data, and issued a fixed-price purchase order to SRI accepting these conditions.

SRI was able to provide a sufficient quantity of Preschool observation booklets to cover Urban Institute needs, but they did not have sufficient Prescott booklets. NCS, Minneapolis, possesses the negatives for printing the booklets, but the price for printing the small quantity needed for the Urban Institute pilot test appeared prohibitive. Fortunately, Applied Management Sciences, Silver Springs, Maryland, possessed 50 extra Prescott booklets, which they gave to the Urban Institute for Human Services.

CIRCUS 17 - Educational Environment Questionnaire. Urban Institute received permission from Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey to produce and administer 50 copies of portions of CIRCUS 17 instrument via a licensing agreement. The Urban Institute agreed to pay a nominal licensing fee to have each copy bear the notation:

Copyright ©1972, 1974 by Educational Testing Services. All rights reserved. Adapted and reprinted under license; and to provide ETS with a copy of each variant edition.

Home Inventory Scale. The Urban Institute received written permission to reprint copies of the scale from the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. The Urban Institute was asked to print the Foundation name and address on the copies and in any reports.[1] The Urban Institute translated the scales into Spanish.

Kohn Social Competence Scale. This scale was developed for teachers of preschool children. Because the Urban Institute desired parent ratings of a child's social competence, in addition to teacher ratings, we requested permission to adapt the scale, as well as administer the classroom scale. Dr. Martin Kohn granted permission to do both and offered to comment on the adapted scale. In a phone conversation, he made several useful suggestions and approved the adapted version. The Urban Institute for Human Services typed and reproduced the necessary quantities for both scales. The Kohn Social Competence Scale for Parents was translated into Spanish.

In-Depth Measures

The in-depth measures included portions of the Parent Attitude Inquiry and the Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test. The schedule of Recent Experiences (SRE) was dropped from the proposed battery because of the heavy response load required by the combination of other measures. The SRE was originally selected to provide an assessment of the level of stress in the lives of parents and teachers.

---

[1] High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 600 N. River St., Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197. (313)485-2000.

Parent Attitude Inquiry. This was developed as an ad hoc measure for use with college-educated parents, as part of a broader study of patterns of parent authority, by Dr. Diana Baumrind, University of California, Berkeley.[2] The Urban Institute requested permission to administer a subset of the items and to revise some of the working; this permission was granted.

Brown Self-Concept Referents Test. Nonexclusive and royalty-free permission to administer this test was granted in writing by Educational Testing Service. ETS stipulated that copies carry the statement "Reprinted by permission. Developed by B.R. Brown, Rutgers University." Dr. Brown also gave verbal permission to administer his test. The Urban Institute reproduced the necessary quantities, and also produced a Spanish translation of the instrument.

A first task in preparing the measures was to satisfy the conditions imposed by the developer; generally, this was to identify the developer on the measure itself. A second task was to obtain Spanish translations of the parent and child interview measures. This task was subcontracted. All Spanish interview schedules were color coded.

The order of administration of the parent and teacher measures was determined. For the parent interview, it was decided to administer the High/Scope Home Environment Questionnaire first. This is the least judgmental of the measures, asking about specific playthings available to the child and how often the parent and child do certain activities; it is also brief. The Kohn Social Competence Rating Scale was ordered second, and before the Process interview, to serve as thought-provoking lead-in into the Process instrument. The Kohn questions about specific types of behaviors and how often the child performs them. (Because OMB clearance

---

[2] See Baumrind, Diana, Current Patterns of Parental Authority, Developmental Psychology Monograph, 1971, 4 (1, Part 2).

was not granted by the time of the Spring data collection period, the Kohn measure did not serve that purpose.) For the In-Depth interviews, the Parent Attitude Inquiry was ordered last. Respondents rarely enjoy a long attitude inquiry, so it was deemed wise to present the most annoying measure last.

The teacher measures were organized as follows: The CIRCUS Educational Environment Questionnaire, two or three Kohn Social Competence Rating Scales, the Spring Process interview, then the remaining Kohns. Because the Process instrument was not administered, it could not serve the function of a respite from rating children.

All measures, typed by the Urban Institute or duplicated from developer's copy, had the spaces for name and school deleted from the copy. Interview booklet covers were designed to display the necessary identifying information (Head Start program ID number Center/Classroom ID #, Respondent/Interviewer #, date of interview and length of interview in minutes). Covers were titled Parent Interview, Teacher Interview, Kohn Social Competence Scale for Teachers, Brown IDS Self-Concept Referents Test. Impact or In-Depth was stamped in large block letters across the top of each cover. The covers of interview booklets were color-coded. It was determined that the impact and in-depth measures should be conducted verbally, so as not to assume literacy. This necessitated the use of a cue sheet with the Kohn Social Competence Scale. The cue sheet provided the five choices of answer: HARDLY EVER OR NEVER; SELDOM; SOMETIMES; OFTEN; VERY OFTEN OR ALWAYS. Special translations were made of all parent and child interview measures.

FIELD OPERATIONS

Field operations technically began with the initial contact with the Head Start Directors. The majority of early contacts with the pilot sites were conducted through letters, samples of which are included in the Appendix . The first contact regarding the pilot test was included with a letter informing each program of the upcoming site development and data collection visits. Tentative dates were scheduled and the Director was asked to agree to it or inform the Urban Institute that the date was impossible. A second letter informed the four pilot sites that they had been selected. The letter included a brief description of the Impact and In-Depth measures, who would be observed and interviewed, and how long the data collection visit would last. Dates were settled upon by all four programs.

Site Development

The next Urban Institute contact with the pilot programs was the two-day site development visits by the Site Monitors. As mentioned in the previous section on Site Monitor training, the Site Monitors had several tasks to perform during the site development visits. The Impact and In-Depth tasks were to acquire (or develop) class rosters of the sample classrooms and obtain the parent names and addresses. The Site Monitor was to determine which children were Fall Process children and include them in the list to whom letters were sent. More children were to be randomly selected from the rosters to achieve a list of 40 (Impact) or 60 (In-Depth). The Site Monitor was to send letters to these parents requesting permission to observe (and interview) the child and review the child's records (see Appendix E). The permission slip was to be signed and returned to the program. This task was accomplished with varying degrees of difficulty. Three of the four pilot programs easily provided class lists and parent addresses; the fourth program did not

have class rosters available in the central office, so the Site Monitor spent several hours assembling a partial list. Arrangements were made for the Research Scientist to call the programs periodically to learn the status of the returns of parent permission slips.

A second task was to arrange appointments with Head Start staff, insofar as possible, for entrance meetings and interviews. The two experimental programs were very interested in meeting the Observers before they entered the classrooms to do observations. For these two programs, meetings were set up for Sunday evening, the day the Site Monitor and Observers were to arrive on site. For the two Control programs, entrance meetings were arranged for the first day of data collection (Monday). For the In-Depth - Control program, meetings were arranged with the Executive Director as well as with the Head Start Director. The Site Monitor of the two Impact-only programs was also able to arrange interview appointments with the teachers (and also Head Start staff, for Process-only interviews).

Site Monitors also assessed the availability of Interviewers and, when possible, hired them. At one site, it was clear that additional effort would be necessary to find Interviewers. The Site Monitors also assembled class schedules, names of teacher aides, and made rough determinations of the number of Spanish translations of measures that would be needed.

Upon returning from the site development visits, the Site Monitors met with the Research Scientist in charge of the Impact and In-Depth evaluation for a debriefing session. During this session, the Research Scientist was receptive to impressions, different perspectives, suggestions as well as objective information. Site Monitors were able to speak to problems of identifying and selecting interviewers and obtaining permission of parents. In addition, the Site Monitors related effective strategies of gaining the cooperation of staff as well as helping to dissipate anxiety associated with having outside personnel evaluating programs.

Spring 1980

Table 1. Observations and Instruments Completed During Site Visits

Site	CFHM Super.	Hd.St. Dir.	MH/CFMH Provider	Coordinator	Teacher CIRCUS	Hi-Sc. Ko/PAI	Kohn Teacher & Aides	Brown	Prescott SRI-Pr. sc.Ob.sy.	SRI Pr. sc.ob. sy.	Other H.S. Staff	# Chld w comp data	# Chld w/one ob misg	TOTAL
Georgetown, TX	1	1	2	-	10	45	*65	34	35	47	2	26	-	268
Indiana	-	1	1	1	4	26	45	-	20	25	-	1	17	144
Hillsboro	-	1	1	-	4	32	80	**40	42	37	2	30	-	269
Monroe	-	1	1	1	5	26	45	-	24	29	-	10	7	149
TOTALS	1	4	5	2	23	129	235	74	121	141	4	67	24	830

*This figure reflects the instruments in the files as of 6/25/80. However, the log sheet shows 67; #5593 and 5593/9953 seem to be missing.

**Forty instruments were received, one is missing out of the files as of 6/25.

Following site development visits, letters were sent to all Program Directors expressing appreciation for their cooperation and reminding them of the dates for upcoming data collection site visits. A subsequent letter was sent to announce the upcoming observation and interview schedules.

Data Collection

By at least the second day of the site visit, Classroom Observers, Teacher Observers, and Interviewers were dispersed to begin the data collection tasks. In addition to the child and teacher observations, Observers administered the Kohn Social Competence Scale to teachers. The Interviewers had the sole responsibility for the parent interviews. The Site Monitor conducted the record reviews and interviewed the Head Start staff and other key staff.

Table 1 reflects the number of observations and number of instruments completed during the site visits. In addition to impact and in-depth data, process data was collected from four Head Start directors, seven MH/CFMH providers, two coordinators and one CFMH supervisor. The use of process instruments for such limited data collection activities did not violate OMS regulations.

Data Management

The data management task began with the packing and shipping of completed instruments to the Urban Institute corporate offices. The Site Monitor had the responsibility of shipping the data to the corporate office before leaving the site. Upon arrival at the Urban Institute for Human Services, the contents of each shipment were logged. The logging procedure was undertaken in two steps. An initial count sheet (see Appendix F) was used to record the number of each item and the data received. Following this step, all data were piled in locked file cabinets.

The second step of logging was performed separately for the observation and interview booklets. The interview booklets (teacher, parent, teacher Kohns and Browns) were recorded individually on Impact and In-Depth Individual Interview Log-in sheets. The Respondent/Interviewer ID number was recorded, as well as the Child ID number in the case of Teacher Kohns; the presence of a consent form was recorded; the number of log and edit sheets was recorded; if the interview had been in Spanish, that was recorded. As each booklet was recorded, the ID #'s were checked against the Data Collection Master Schedules used by the Site Monitors; the consent form was removed after the R/I ID number was recorded on it and a C.F. notation was made on the booklet cover; the booklet was flipped through to check for completeness and <u>incomplete</u> was marked on the cover where necessary.

On the second step log-in of Prescott and SRI Observation Data sheets, the following information was recorded: the focus person ID number, after checking against the Master Data Collection Schedule; the Observer ID number; the booklet numbers, the number of log sheets; and for the Prescotts; the presence of a permission-to-observe slip.

A final edit was performed in each of the 262 SRI-Prescott and SRI Preschool observation booklets in preparation for having the optically

scanned. Three Observers were retained to complete approximately 80 hours of editing. The editing tasks included:

(a) checking the numbers written in all ID grids on the cover and throughout the booklet;

(b) checking the sequence numbers of the observations;

(c) locating and cancelling blank, incomplete and illegal frames;

(d) checking the size and darkness of each bible; and

(e) checking the log sheets for problems and removing the problem sheets. As well, supplementing identifying information was added to the booklets in order to be included on the tape of the scanned booklets. This information included the idenfication numbers of the second observer in the Prescott booklets, the Head Start program site number and the center/classroom identification number.

The edited booklets were sent to Intrans for optical scanning and conversion to magnetic tape. The raw frequency data were then shipped to Abt Associates in Cambridge, Mass. for the first stage of data analysis. At Abt Associates, the frequency data from the SRI Prescott were transformed into a set of variables adapted from the National Day Care Study and another set of variables developed by the Urban Institute's research staff. Another set of variables, including sequence variables, were developed from the SRI-Preschool frequency data. The second stage of data analysis is in progress.